



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/207,130	12/08/1998	DANIEL VIERA CONRAD	RA9-98-053	6377

25299 7590 04/23/2002

IBM CORPORATION  
PO BOX 12195  
DEPT 9CCA, BLDG 002  
RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709

EXAMINER

ROBINSON BOYCE, AKIBA K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3623

DATE MAILED: 04/23/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

cd

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/207,130

Applicant(s)

CONRAD ET AL.

Examiner

Akiba K Robinson-Boyce

Art Unit

2163

-- Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 March 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other:

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Prosecution Application***

The request filed on 3/26/02 for a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 09/207130 is acceptable and a CPA has been established. An action on the CPA follows.

### ***Status***

Claims 1-15 are pending in this application. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Binkley, et al (US Patent 5,088,033), in view of Weber (US Patent 5,812, 668).

As per claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 14, 15, Binkley, et al discloses:  
providing an emulation module.../providing an emulation object.../an emulation module.../an emulation object...(Col. 3, lines 34-37, Col. 8, lines 62-68).  
ensuring that the application will utilize the emulation module.../ensuring that the application will utilize the emulation object.../means for ensuring.../wherein the application is capable of utilizing the emulation module in lieu of the device.../emulating the interaction...(Col. 6, line 66-Col. 7, line 4);

executing the application on the development system independently.../wherein the application is executed on the system, the emulation module and the application independently.../wherein the application is executed on the development system, the emulation module and the application emulate the interaction...(Col. 1, lines 60-62, Col. 1, line 66-Col. 2, line 1, Col. 2, lines 9-19, Col. 7, lines 32-38, [where the examiner is interpreting the "development system" and the "point of sale system" of the present invention to be analogous to the "host system" and "target system" of Binkley, et al];

ensuring that the application adequately utilizes the emulation object...(Col. 2, lines 9-13);

modifying the application...(Col. 1, lines 11-14, Col. 2, lines 13-19).

allowing a developer to provide input...(Col. 50, lines 41-43);

providing the input to the application in a form expected...(Col. 51, lines 3-17).

Binkley, et al fails to teach the following, however, Weber discloses:

A point of sale system...(Col. 65, lines 54-63,w/ abstract, lines 1-11)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for the device to be specialized for the point of sale equipment because the transactions which are being tested on a different computer in Weber (test gateway computer) is occurring in a pos environment. In this case, since transactions are occurring at a pos system, any device used at the pos must therefore be specialized or formatted to operate at the pos system.

As per claims 3, 10, Binkley, et al discloses:

wherein the application is platform independent...(Col. 58, line 46-Col. 59, line 10).

As per claim 5, 12, Binkley, et al discloses:

wherein the point of sale equipment includes a driver...(Col. 19, line 67-Col. 20, line 6).

As per claim 6, 13, Binkley, et al discloses:

wherein the emulation object emulates the driver and the device...(Col. 19, lines 11-15, Col. 19, line 67-Col. 20, line 6).

As per claims 4, 11, Binkley, et al fails to teach the following, however Weber discloses:

wherein the application is a JAVA application...(Col. 7, lines 15-17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make the application and the emulation object platform independent because in a computer environment, applications are constantly being changed around and depending on these changes and the needs of the user, the platforms will also need to change in order to fit the environment. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make the application and the emulation object JAVA applications because JAVA is a common, distributed programming language that is simple and is used for object-oriented programming in the application development art.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 7, 8, 14, 15, 2-3, 5-6, 9-10 and 12-13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's arguments filed 3/26/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As per claims 4 and 11, the applicant argues that Weber contains no mention of the use of an emulation object for emulating the device of the point of sale system on a development system that is independent of the point of sale system or emulating a

Art Unit: 2163


device specialized for use with the point of sale system. However, Weber discloses a system where a transaction which can occur at a point of sale system is tested on a system that is not the pos system (on the test gateway computer). In a transaction at a point of sale, it is obvious to use specialized pos devices to carry out the operation since they do occur at a point of sale. The combination of the Binkley, et al reference and Weber reference discloses the emulation object used to enforce this type of operation since Binkley, et al describes this feature in Col. 3, lines 34-37 and Col. 8, lines 62-68.


### **Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Akiba K Robinson-Boyce whose telephone number is 703-305-1340. The examiner can normally be reached on Flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on 703-305-9643. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7238 [After final communications, labeled "Box AF"], 703-746-7239 [Official Communications], and 703-746-7150 [Informal/Draft Communications, labeled "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"].

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

  
A. R.-B.  
April 22, 2002

  
KYLE J. CHOI  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
Art Unit 2163